REMARKS

Claims 14-29 were pending. By this Amendment, claims 14, 19 and 22 have been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter, and new claim 30 has been added. Accordingly, claims 14-30 would be pending upon entry of this amendment, with claims 14, 19 and 22 being in independent form. Applicant requests examination of all of the pending claims (including claims 27-29, which were added by the Amendment filed July 14, 2009, and new claim 30) of the present application.

Claims 14-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,922,255 to Tomida in view of Watanabe (US 2002/0122215 A1) and McAfee (US 2004/0021889 A1).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 14 and 22 of the present application are allowable over the cited art, for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose or suggest the aspects of the present application of (a) subject name registration part configured to register for each of a plurality of registered user codes (specific to a specific operator and differentiating the specific operator from other operators of the communication apparatus), corresponding ***subject names*** associated with the registered user code, and (b) subject name specifying part configured to automatically determine a subject name from ***among the subject names*** registered for the specific user code of the current operator, as the transmission subject name of the mail data to be transmitted.

As previously discussed in the record, Tomida, as understood by applicant, proposes an Internet facsimile device wherein e-mail data is transmitted along with a header including a title selected by a user using the facsimile device. In the Internet facsimile device proposed by Tomida, any of multiple one-touch keys can be associated with a corresponding title, and any

user can designate the title by depressing one of the one-touch keys.

As already discussed in the record (but not addressed by the Examiner), the one-touch keys are ***NOT*** equatable to user codes since the keys are ***NOT*** specific to a specific operator and differentiating the specific operator from other operators of the communication apparatus. Instead, each one touch key in the device of Tomida can be operated by any user to invoke the function corresponding to the key.

Likewise, the selection of one of plural prestored default titles does not involve a user code since the default titles are ***NOT*** specific to a specific operator and differentiating the specific operator from other operators of the communication apparatus. Instead, the selection, regardless of the operator is drawn from the same pool of default titles.

Further, it is noted that each one-touch key in Tomida can be associated with, at maximum, one corresponding title, and Tomida says nothing about associating multiple titles with a one-touch key and then selecting one of the associated titles when the one-touch key is operated.

Tomida simply does not disclose or suggest selecting one of a plurality of subject names that are registered for a specific user code that is specific to a specific operator and differentiating the specific operator from other operators of the communication apparatus, and using such a subject name selected in such a manner as the transmission subject name of the mail data to be transmitted.

As already discussed at length in the record, Watanabe, as understood by applicant, proposes a facsimile apparatus wherein one or more items of account information can be registered in an internal memory of the facsimile apparatus, and one of these items of account information is selected for use in authentication processing. For example, a user may be required

to specify a user name and password before the user can use the facsimile apparatus.

The user ID and password in the apparatus proposed in Watanabe are equated with a user code.

However, while Watanabe adopts the conventional use of user ID and password for authentication purposes, Watanabe says nothing whatsoever regarding using such information to determine one of a plurality of subject names that are registered for a specific operator, and using such a subject name selected in such a manner as the transmission subject name of the mail data to be transmitted.

Thus, neither Tomida nor Watanabe disclose or suggest the above-mentioned aspects (a) and (b) of the present application.

McAfee, as understood by applicant, proposes a multi function (scan, copy and print) peripheral device (MFP) wherein the device is user operable to directly establish a communication link with a network server having email receive and transmit functionality, and to transmit to the network server over the transmission link, message header data including at least an email address of a sender and of at least one intended recipient, accompanied by the scanned content of a source document scanned by the device, to the network server for transmission to the or each recipient.

McAfee, [0029], states as follows regarding an e-mail transmission process:

> [0029] In response to receipt of the dial up data sequence, the email server 100 and the MFP 10 carry out standard handshake procedures to establish a communication link between them (Step 210). Then, the MFP 10 retrieves from the memory region 40B and transmits the ***User Account Information and Password data*** over the communication link 28 to the email server 100 where it is compared with valid User Account Identification and associated Password data stored at the email server 100. If the transmitted and stored data do not match, an error message is transmitted from the email server 100 back to the MFP 10 and displayed on the display panel 26, and absent connection and transmission of a valid User Account and Password data, the communication link is dropped after a predetermined delay.

> Validation of the User Account and Password data at the email server 100, is transmitted back to the MFP 10 and in response, at step 212, the control circuit 32 initiates retrieval of the recipient and copy recipient email addresses and ***the Subject data from the storage region 40B of the memory 40*** and adds to the message header data the sender's email address data together with any other data typically transmitted as part of an email header, e.g. time and date of transmission, and transmits the complete header data directly to the email server 100 over the interface 42 and the communication link 28. Transmission of the email header data is then followed by transmission of data resulting from scanning of the document 14. The scanned data (step 200) can be generated immediately following transmission of the message header data in step 212 or may be retrieved from the memory 40, having been entered by initiation of the scanning process (step 200) on actuation of the START key following entry of the message header data in response to the Header Prompt Menu. The scanned data is appended to the transmitted header data using standard MIME (Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions).

Thus, McAfee proposes use of user account and password information to perform authentication for the requested access, and once the access has been validated, proceeds to retrieve the data for the e-mail to be transmitted, including recipient and Cc: address, Subject data, sender's e-mail address, time and date of transmission.

However, such data/information, including the Subject data stored in memory, are specific to the e-mail to be transmitted. McAfee says nothing whatsoever regarding registering such Subject data per specific operator, nor does McAfee disclose or suggest registering for each of a plurality of registered user codes, corresponding subject names associated with the registered user code.

Further, even the Subject data in McAfee at best corresponds to only one subject name, that does not involve selecting one of ***a plurality of*** subject names that are registered for a specific user code that is specific to a specific operator and differentiating the specific operator from other operators of the communication apparatus.

Applicant submits that the cited art, even when considered along with common sense and common knowledge to one skilled in the art, does ***NOT*** render unpatentable the above-

mentioned aspects of independent claims 14 and 22 of the present application.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 14 and 22, and the claims depending therefrom, are allowable over the cited art.

Likewise, the cited art does not disclose or suggest the aspects of independent claim 19 of the present application of a subject name specifying part configured to automatically specify ***another subject name including the mail address registered for the specific user code*** as the transmission subject name of the mail data to be transmitted, ***if the code determination part determines that the specific user code of the current operator has been specified and the address registration determination part determines that the mail address is registered for the specific user code.***

While Tomida proposes that the title can be extracted from the document scanned and to be transmitted such document does not inherently include an e-mail address, nor does Tomida even disclose or suggest extracting specifically an e-mail address from the document. In any event, even if the information extracted from the document is, per chance, an e-mail address, such e-mail address is not registered specific for the user code nor even the specific operator. Instead, the extracted information is applied as the title in a header of the transmission.

Further, although Tomida proposes that a one-touch key can be associated with a title specified by a user (and such title can include any type of information that a user might enter), Tomida says nothing regarding including a mail address registered for a specific user code (of the current operator) in the subject name, ***if the code determination part determines that the specific user code of the current operator has been specified, and the address registration determination part determines that the mail address is registered for the specific user code.*** That is, even assuming that the user associates the one-touch key in the device of Tomida with an

e-mail address specified as a title by the user, such e-mail address will be applied as the title of an e-mail when the one-touch key is operated. In Tomida, application of e-mail address associated with the one-touch key as the title of the e-mail is not determined based on if the code determination part determines that the specific user code of the current operator has been specified and the address registration determination part determines that the mail address is registered for the specific user code. In the case that an e-mail address is associated with the one-touch key as the title, such e-mail will be applied when the one-touch key is operated.

Regarding McAfee, applicant submits that McAfee does not disclose or suggest registering a mail address for a specific user code.

Further, McAfee, like the other references, says nothing whatsoever regarding automatically specify ***another subject name including the mail address registered for the specific user code*** as the transmission subject name of the mail data to be transmitted, ***if the code determination part determines that the specific user code of the current operator has been specified and the address registration determination part determines that the mail address is registered for the specific user code.***

Applicant submits that the cited art, even when considered along with common sense and common knowledge to one skilled in the art, simply does ***NOT*** render unpatentable the above-mentioned aspects of independent claim 19 of the present application.

In view of the remarks hereinabove, applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, and earnestly solicits the allowance of the application.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge any required fees in connection with this amendment, and to credit any overpayment, to our Deposit

Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Teng, Reg. No. 40,837
Attorney for Applicant
Cooper & Dunham LLP
Tel.: (212) 278-0400